



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

disappear before national obligations; it is because, from the time she gave us access to every career, we have served her with ardour and devotion in every path of human activity; it is because she has seen us and ever will see us ready to undergo any sacrifice and encounter any danger, even to shed our last drop of blood in defence of her integrity and honour, that she counts us among her children, and shows us the same tender affection as we feel for her. Whatever our detractors may say, France has not children more loving, more devoted, and more grateful than ourselves" (p. 221).

In England, where duelling is no more, the following extract will be read with interest: "But if it be our duty to follow the opinion of the majority, it is on the express condition that that opinion should be in conformity with the immutable laws of truth and justice. To follow it under all circumstances would be to expose ourselves sometimes to the sanction of great wrongs. What, for example, is more iniquitous than the duel? Is it not the height of absurdity that in order to save our honour we should have to incur the risk of receiving a mortal wound from him who has committed an outrage on our dignity?" (p. 287).

The author's treatment of quotations is tantalizing. Sometimes references are given, at other times they are omitted. In the former case, the quotations are usually familiar, and the best citations from Talmud or Midrash are left without any indication as to their exact source.

Although the volume is unequal in parts, one cannot fail to recognize the piety and the learning of the author. In closing the book one's only regret is that, as the primary facts of religion and morality are changeless, nothing would have been lost and much gained by these principles being clothed in a more modern garb.

S. LEVY.

THE PSALMS OF SOLOMON.

1. *Die Datierung der Psalmen Salomos, ein Beitrag zur jüdischen Geschichte*, von Lic. th. W. FRANKENBERG (Beihefte zur *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Giessen, 1896).
2. *Les Dix-Huit Bénédictions et les Psauties de Salomon*, par M. ISRAEL LÉVI (*Revue des Études Juives*, tome XXXII, No. 64, pp. 161-178).
3. Review of Frankenberg's essay, by Prof. E. SCHÜRER (*Theologische Literaturzeitung*, Feb. 6, 1897).

I HAVE placed these three publications together for obvious reasons. The review of Prof. Schürer, indeed, effectively disposes

of Herr Frankenberg's attempt to revive Ewald's theory that the Psalms of Solomon are a product of the Maccabean age. Not that the Pompeian theory is without difficulty. The Psalms are not, on the face of them, so distinctly of a party character as the now generally accepted theory of Wellhausen would require. Sometimes the atmosphere of the Psalms is better suited to the Maccabean period than to the age of Pompey. But Renan is simply begging the question when he remarks (*Histoire du Peuple d'Israël*, V, 150): "Les sources talmudiques ne mentionnent pas le siège de Pompée ; la *Megillath Taanith*, 'livre des jeûnes,' qui consacre des anniversaires insignifiants, n'a pas de souvenir pour cet évènement. Les vaincus de l'an 63 n'eurent pas la consolation ordinaire des vaincus, qui est de noircir leurs vainqueurs. Pompée ne fut nullement traité par la légende comme Nabuchodonosor et Tite. On admira sa modération ; on trouva qu'il s'était comporté selon ce que l'on attendait de sa vertu (*Josephus, Antiq.* XIV, iv, 4). Pas une trace de deuil ni de colère. Quand on compare cela au siège qui eut lieu cent trente-trois ans plus tard ! La chute des Amonéens fut évidemment une délivrance, un soulagement pour Israël." Between the lines of Josephus' mild account one can read that Pompey's entry to Jerusalem was marked by much oppression. The intrusion of Pompey into the Holy of Holies (*Josephus, Antiq.* XIV, iv, 4) must have left a strong impression on the Jewish imagination, but it may well have been obliterated later on by the more bitter memory of the deeds of Titus. In particular, Herr Frankenberg fails utterly to explain Ps. Sol. ii. 30-31 of Antiochus. To take this circumstantial account of the oppressor's death, with Ewald and Frankenberg, as a pious and unfulfilled wish, is indeed impossible. The verbal and general agreement of this passage with the death of Pompey as described by Plutarch is unanswerably close. And, as every one has recognized, the seventeenth Psalm clearly refers to Pompey, and has no relevance (esp. verse 9) to Antiochus.

Indeed, Herr Frankenberg's essay would hardly have been written had he been better acquainted with the literature of the subject. He does not meet some of the clearest points in favour of the Pompeian theory. He altogether ignores the phrase (xvii. 14) ἐξαπέστειλεν αὐτὰ ἔως ἐπὶ δυσμῶν, which exactly corresponds with the conduct of Pompey, who sent Aristobulus and his family to Rome to adorn his triumph. What prisoners were sent to the West by Antiochus ? Against these and other definite points Frankenberg urges nothing. Yet he would have found them raised in the works of Ryle and James and of other writers on these Psalms. Again, would a Jewish writer have said of Antiochus that he came "from the uttermost parts of the earth"

(viii. 16)? What drought or famine (Ps. v) can be placed in the Maccabean age? Cf., however, Josephus, *Antiq.* XIV, ii, for a drought at the period of the outbreak of hostilities between Hyrcanus and Aristobulus. Finally, I recall no clear passage in the Psalms of Solomon parallel to the definite statements in Daniel and the Books of the Maccabees that the oppressor of the Jews forced the latter to partake of forbidden food. The only allusion in the Psalms of Solomon is to general desecrations of the altar by lax priests.

At the end of his essay Herr Frankenberg places a useful translation of the Psalms of Solomon into Hebrew. This translation is frequently happy and effective, but too often his Hebrew is the Hebrew of the dictionary. And it certainly arouses some astonishment to read the author's remark on p. 63: "Damit ist zugleich gesagt dass der Zweck dieser Version nicht der ist, eine lesbare hebräische Übersetzung zu liefern, sondern der rein wissenschaftliche, das verlorene Original wenigstens einigermassen dem Leser näher zu bringen." I know that some modern emendators of the MT. imagine that they can write better Hebrew than Isaiah, but it is a new thing to hear that the original Hebrew of the Psalms of Solomon was something else than "readable Hebrew."

Finally, I would refer those who are interested in the Psalms of Solomon to M. Israel Lévi's remarkable and original essay, which is placed second at the head of this notice. In this essay M. Lévi argues that the whole of the eighteen Benedictions were completed before the destruction of the Temple. Be that as it may, he proves that there are some striking parallels between the eighteen (or nineteen) Psalms of Solomon and the eighteen (or nineteen) Benedictions which appear in the daily service of the Synagogue. M. Lévi holds that the eighteen Benedictions were all composed earlier than the Psalms of Solomon, therefore before B.C. 63. Now it is very probable that the first three and the last three of the Benedictions are even as old as the Maccabean period. But are the rest as old? M. Lévi lays down the canon: "Selon qu'une œuvre littéraire des derniers temps de l'indépendance juive trahit de l'hostilité ou de l'admiration ou simplement de l'ignorance à l'égard des Romains, on peut affirmer qu'elle est antérieure ou postérieure à cet évènement (viz. the campaign of Pompey). Le Schemonè-Esré doit donc avoir été composé, dans ses plus récentes parties, avant l'année 63."

But I cannot see the force of this argument. On the contrary there are two good reasons why the Psalms of Solomon seem anterior to the eighteen Benedictions in their complete form. First, the Psalms of Solomon were evidently written at a special, defined crisis. It is far more probable that some of its ideas were subsequently *generalized*

than that a general form already existent would be specialized to suit the case of Pompey. The analogy of the canonical Psalms strongly supports my view.

But, secondly, M. Lévi's brilliant discovery of a parallel between the eighteen Benedictions and the Psalms of Solomon, suggests the solution of a very serious problem. "It is possible" (write Messrs. Ryle and James, p. lix.) "that the whole collection of the Psalms of Solomon was intended for public or even liturgical use." In two passages the word διάψαλμα (*Selah*) occurs, viz. in xvii. 31 and xviii. 10, while the titles of Psalms viii, *νίκος*; x and xiv, *ὑμνος*, point to a musical setting. True, these headings and the occurrence of Selah have been regarded as interpolations, but if so, why are similar additions not more frequent? Copyists would have thrown in more than a paltry doublet of Selahs if they were arbitrarily inserting them. Again, and this is important, Psalm ix. concludes: *τοῦ κυρίου ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραὴλ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἔτι*; Psalms x-xii with similar verses. I must quote the close of Psalm xi: *ποιήσαι κύριος ἡ ἐλάλησεν ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ ἀναστήσαι κύριος τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐν ὄνδραις δόξης αὐτῷ· τοῦ κυρίου τὸ ἔλεος ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἔτι*. Cf. also Psalm iii. 2, and other passages. Now these are clear doxologies, or indications that the Psalms were used in public worship. If so, why has all trace of them vanished from Jewish sources? M. Lévi supplies the answer. Because they were effaced by the eighteen Benedictions which were probably completed long after B. C. 63. It may be, as Prof. Cheyne says, that the Psalms of Solomon are "a fine specimen of the best Judaism of their time," but the eighteen Benedictions are a finer specimen. "Noticeable," says M. Israel Lévi, "is the serenity that reigns in the eighteen Benedictions." There is no recrimination for any but *internal* foes. Hence they were in every way more suitable for public worship than a Psalter which was written in the throes of an invasion. Hence, perhaps, the Psalter was deposed from its temporary place in the liturgy, and in consequence fell into oblivion among the Jews.

I. ABRAHAMS.